DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 416 758 HE 031 004

AUTHOR	Main, Eleanor C.
TITLE	Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity (TATTO) Program.
INSTITUTION	Emory Univ., Atlanta, GA. Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1994-08-31
NOTE	25p.
CONTRACT	P116A1 0439
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Course Content; Departments; *Faculty Development; *Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Interprofessional Relationship; Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Improvement; *Teaching Assistants; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS	Emory University GA

ABSTRACT

The Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity (TATTO) program began in spring 1991 at Emory University to prepare graduate students to be teaching assistants, instructors, and tomorrow's professors, and is based on the premise that doctoral students should be trained in both teaching and research. The first part of the four-stage program is a three and one-half day course offered prior to the fall term and preceding a student's first teaching experience. Program faculty are among the best teachers from across the university, and the syllabus covers general topics important to students across disciplines. In the second stage of the program, students proceed to discipline-specific training in the department, with this optimally occurring at the same time as they participate in their first teaching opportunity--the teaching assistantship. The third stage is a closely monitored initial teaching opportunity supervised by a faculty member. The teaching associateship, the fourth stage, advances the graduate student to a teaching opportunity with greater responsibilities and allows the graduate student to co-teach with a faculty member. Evaluation of the program included student evaluations of the course, students' teaching portfolios, interviews with faculty members supervising the TATTO program, and interviews with representatives from 15 of the 20 departments within the College of Arts and Sciences. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 416 758

Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity (TATTO) Program.

Grantee Organization:

Emory University
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
202 Administration Building
Atlanta, GA 30322

Grant Number:

P116A1 0439

Project Dates:

Starting Date:	September 1, 1991
Ending Date:	August 31, 1994
Number of Months:	36

Project Director:

Eleanor C. Main
Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Emory University
202 Administration Building
Atlanta, GA 30322

FIPSE Program Officer(s): Preston Forbes

Grant Award:		
	Year 1	$ 58,255
	Year 2	61,052
	Year 3	65,540
	Total	$184,847

HE 031 004

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In spring 1991, Emory University's Graduate School of Arts and Sciences began its Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity (TATTO) program to prepare graduate students to be teaching assistants, instructors, and tomorrow's professors. Based on the premise that doctoral students should be trained in both teaching and research, the TATTO program strives to ensure that each student's education as a research scholar is balanced with a thoughtful and thorough preparation in the art of teaching. The TATTO program, a multi-stage program monitored and coordinated by the Graduate School, consists of a Graduate School course, a department specific course, a teaching assistantship, and a teaching associateship. During its first three years, 1991 to 1993, a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) supported faculty and program costs connected with the three to four day Graduate School course.

Eleanor C. Main
Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies
202 Administration Building
Atlanta, GA 30322
(404) 727-2669

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

In spring 1991, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Emory University developed the Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity (TATTO) program to prepare graduate students to be teaching assistants, instructors, and tomorrow's professors. The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences believes that doctoral students should be trained in both teaching and research.

The TATTO program is a multi-stage program, consisting of a Graduate School course, a department specific course, a teaching assistantship, and a teaching associateship. Selected graduate students receive an Assistant Instructorship (renamed Dean's Teaching Fellowship) and are fully responsible for teaching one course per semester in their fifth year.

B. PURPOSE

The TATTO program strives to ensure that each student's education as a research scholar is balanced with a thoughtful and thorough preparation in the art of teaching. The Graduate School firmly believes that teaching and research are not in conflict. Rather, the pursuit of knowledge and its dissemination through the multi and varied forms of teaching is a creative symbiosis. The TATTO program provides training for Emory's doctoral students prior to their first teaching experience at Emory and furnishes students with specific teaching opportunities. The program is a multi-stage process, monitored and coordinated by the Graduate School.

C. BACKGROUND AND ORIGINS

As Emory grew larger and emphasized research, it sought to protect and enhance its teaching mission. A number of programs in the 1980s augmented teaching. Most of these programs, however, largely benefitted the regular faculty and undergraduates and had little impact on graduate students. Emory had relied on individual departments to train graduate students for the teaching profession. Unfortunately, this strategy resulted in many of our graduate students completing their degrees and entering the professoriate having little, if any, teaching experience, and often even less pedagogical training. Those who did teach often came to regard their teaching experience as "dues to be paid" rather than an integral part of their education and career. A number of graduate students held university fellowships that exempted them from any responsibilities other than fulfilling their degree programs. A system in which the highest honors and rewards were offered to those students who do not teach sent a powerful message to graduate students: research is important, but teaching is not. In keeping with Emory's interest in teaching and its recent emphasis on teaching programs for faculty, this system required some change. Our particular challenge as a private research university was to provide good teaching opportunities for our graduate students and to maintain excellent instruction for undergraduate students.

The Graduate School funded stipends for the students attending the Graduate School course. Students were not given any additional support to fund their participation in stages two through four of the TATTO program. About ninety five percent of Emory's graduate students receive tuition and stipend support from the Graduate School. However, the minority of doctoral students who receive no aid or who receive funding from non-Emory sources must fulfill these stages without extra compensation. We realize that this funding situation may be unique to Emory and that other schools might have more difficulty in requiring such an extensive program of all their doctoral students. The Graduate School funded the first year of the Assistant Instructorship (Dean's Teaching Fellowship) program with "soft money" recovered from unused stipends; the University then added the money as a budget item. Currently there are 23 Dean's Teaching Fellows receiving a stipend of $12,750. The FIPSE grant provided three years of support for the faculty teaching in the Graduate School course and for other expenses related to the development of that course. The Graduate School will assume these expenses in August 1995.

D. PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

The first stage of TATTO is a three and one-half day course offered by the Graduate School immediately prior to the fall term and preceding a student's first teaching experience. Faculty for this course are among the best teachers from across the University. The syllabus covers general topics of importance to all students, no matter what their disciplines. Students receive information specific to Emory College, its rules, and academic support services. Separate sessions consider sexual and other discriminatory harassment and deliberate the ethical questions of the teaching profession. Other workshops cover subjects including syllabus writing and grading, lecturing and leading discussions, the use of writing as a pedagogical tool, the conduct of lab sessions, and the use of new technologies. The cap-stone experience of the Graduate School course is micro-teaching. Each student conducts a mini-class before a group of peers and a faculty member, who then offer a critique of the teaching performance. All graduate students who have any teaching responsibilities must complete the Graduate School course.

In the second stage of TATTO, the student proceeds to discipline specific training in his or her department. Each department and program offering the Ph.D. has created a course for its students that addresses the problems and teaching strategies from a discipline perspective. Optimally, students enroll in this course at the same time they participate in their first teaching opportunity, the Teaching Assistantship.

The nature of the Teaching Assistantship, the third stage of the TATTO program, varies from department to department. The defining characteristic of the Teaching Assistantship, across all departments and programs, is a controlled, carefully monitored initial teaching opportunity. A faculty member closely supervises, guides and evaluates the graduate student.

D. PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

The first stage of TATTO is a three and one-half day course offered by the Graduate School immediately prior to the fall term and preceding a student's first teaching experience. Faculty for this course are among the best teachers from across the University. The syllabus covers general topics of importance to all students, no matter what their disciplines. Students receive information specific to Emory College, its rules, and academic support services. Separate sessions consider sexual and other discriminatory harassment issues and deliberate the ethical questions relevant to the teaching profession. Other workshops cover subjects including syllabus writing and grading, lecturing and leading discussions, the use of writing as a pedagogical tool, the conduct of lab sessions, and the use of new technologies. The cap-stone experience of the Graduate School course is micro-teaching. Each student conducts a mini-class before a group of peers and a faculty member, who then offer a critique of the teaching performance.

The nature of the Teaching Assistantship, the third stage of the TATTO program, varies from department to department. The defining characteristic of the Teaching Assistantship, across all departments and programs, is a controlled, carefully monitored initial teaching opportunity. A faculty member closely supervises, guides and evaluates the graduate student.

The Teaching Associateship, the fourth stage of the TATTO program, advances the graduate student to a teaching opportunity with greater responsibilities. The Teaching Associate and a faculty member engage in a co-teaching experience. Although co-teaching experiences differ from department to department, the signature of the Teaching Associateship is the close partnership of the faculty member and the graduate student. In many departments, co-teaching involves the collaboration of graduate student and faculty member in all aspects of a course, from syllabus design to final grading. As does the Teaching Assistant, the Teaching Associate receives attentive mentoring and evaluation.

Students who have satisfactorily completed all four stages of the TATTO program are eligible for an Assistant Instructor Fellowship (Dean's Teaching Fellowship). Assistant Instructors are entirely responsible for all the responsibilities of teaching a course including designing the syllabus, selecting books, teaching, and grading. The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences offers a number of these fellowships to students (usually in their fifth year) on a competitive basis. Assistant Instructors teach one course each semester while making considerable progress on their doctoral dissertations. Departments nominate students, based on their teaching qualifications and advancement in their degree programs. The applicants submit teaching evaluations, a statement of teaching aims, and, in consultation with the department, a plan (including syllabi) for teaching specific courses. Ideally, Assistant Instructors teach one introductory and one upper level course. A faculty committee selects the Assistant Instructors. Acting on the suggestion of current Assistant Instructors we have changed the name of this position to Dean's Teaching Fellows.

E. EVALUATION/PROJECT RESULTS

TATTO is an ongoing program at Emory University. The Graduate School course responded to evaluations and has made significant changes and improvements. TATTO has succeeded in changing the academic culture of Emory's graduate education in just three years. Departments have institutionalized their programs. In most of the programs, the department specific course continues to be refined and developed. Faculty have developed methods to evaluate Teaching Assistants. Many departments have defined the Teaching Associateship so that it reflects the desire to give students increased responsibilities. However, in a few departments the students are not closely working with faculty; in some, the responsibilities may be marginal not true "teaching opportunities."

The Graduate School will continue to evaluate all aspects of the program, including a reexamination of the departmental implementation of the various stages of the program.

F. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The word TATTO has entered the Emory vocabulary. As more and more faculty become involved with the program, it becomes their creation and ceases to be viewed as a requirement imposed by the Graduate School. Increasingly, departments use the program for recruitment and placement. As time has past, positive comments from the students increase. Had we taken the "safer" route and introduced the program in stages, it would still be in its infancy and most likely would never have been adopted across the board. Full institutional backing for the goals and implementation of the program as well as financial support was absolutely essential to its success and further progress.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FINAL REPORT 1

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW 1

B. PURPOSE 1

C. BACKGROUND AND ORIGIN 2

D. PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS 5

E. EVALUATION/PROJECT RESULTS 7

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL 8

Program Flexibility & Program Integrity 9

The Graduate School Course 11

The Assistant Instructor Fellowship 13

THE DEPARTMENTS 14

The Department Course 14

The TATTO Supervisor 15

The Teaching Portfolio 15

THE ACADEMIC CULTURE 15

Sixth Year Review 16

F. CONTINUATION AND DISSEMINATION 16

G. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 17

APPENDIX 19

FINAL REPORT

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Emory University developed the Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity (TATTO) program to prepare graduate students to be teaching assistants, instructors, and tomorrow's professors. The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences believes that doctoral students should be trained in both teaching and research. Three closely related beliefs ground this program: the dissemination of knowledge is as important as its creation, good teaching can be taught, and teaching skills have a value that reaches beyond the classroom. Within a wider context, TATTO is an effort to alter the academic culture so as to encourage faculty and students to value research and teaching. As characterized by the Graduate School, the goal of TATTO is not to force tradeoffs between teaching and research but to train graduate students to do both well.

The TATTO program, required of every doctoral student, is a multi-stage program, consisting of a Graduate School course, a discipline specific course, a teaching assistantship, and a teaching associateship. Selected graduate students receive an Assistant Instructorship (renamed Dean's Teaching Fellowship) and are fully responsible for teaching one course per semester in their fifth year.

During its first three years, 1991 to 1993, a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) has supported part of Emory's TATTO program. The funding supported honoraria for faculty and program costs associated with the Graduate School course.

B. PURPOSE

In Spring 1991, the Executive Committee of the Graduate School approved the Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity (TATTO) program to prepare graduate students to enter the professoriate as competent and confident teachers. The TATTO program strives to ensure that a thoughtful and thorough preparation in the art of teaching balances each student's education as a research scholar. The Graduate School firmly believes that teaching and research are not in conflict. Rather, the pursuit of knowledge and its dissemination through the multi and varied forms of teaching is a creative symbiosis. The TATTO program, a multi-stage process monitored and coordinated by the Graduate School provides training for Emory's doctoral students prior to their first teaching experience at Emory and furnishes students with specific teaching opportunities.

Many universities have programs for training teaching assistants. However, three characteristics distinguish the Emory TATTO program from others throughout the country. First, every student entering the Ph.D. program since fall 1992 must participate in the TATTO program as one component of his/her academic requirements. Second, TATTO is a graduated experience involving four stages of increasing independence in the classroom for all its participants. Each stage of the training program carries two hours credit, thus certifying the various teaching experiences. Third, TATTO requires a minimum and maximum teaching

opportunity during the students' first four years. (Note: International students must be evaluated in English as a Second Language (ESL), including classes in pronunciation and writing where necessary, for matriculation in a degree program and before their participation in TATTO.)

In each of the past four years, about 260 students participated in the first stage of TATTO, the Graduate School course. The students then proceeded to their departmental specific teaching courses, at least one teaching assistantship and one teaching associateship.

During the grant period, faculty, students and administrators refined the Graduate School course. Departments designed and offered their discipline specific teaching courses. Faculty defined the duties of teaching assistants and teaching associates and developed ways to mentor and to evaluate students engaged in these teaching opportunities. A faculty committee reviewed each of the department's policies and procedures. Some 60 Assistant Instructors (renamed Dean's Teaching Fellows) have taught courses over the past three years.

Initially, the TATTO requirements engendered mixed reactions. Some departments responded positively, others were quite resistant. However, as the departments developed their programs and their students provided positive feedback, the support for TATTO is growing. Each year about 30 faculty participate in the Graduate School course; over the four years about 75 different faculty have either lectured, led small group discussions, or evaluated micro-teaching. These faculty who come from many departments in Emory College, the Theology School and the Medical School actively designs the sessions and evaluate them. In fact, some departments credit TATTO both with attracting students to their doctoral programs and with placing students in faculty positions. TATTO has energized some faculty have been energized to evaluate their own teaching; junior faculty at Emory have requested that they be able to take a similar course.

C. BACKGROUND AND ORIGIN

During the past ten years, the administration and faculty of Arts and Sciences have undertaken a number of projects to emphasize the quality of teaching. In 1984, the Lilly Endowment enabled Emory College to offer special seminars on teaching to junior faculty. In 1986, and then in 1988, with funds from the Ford Foundation and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation respectively, faculty and students began participating together in intensive workshops and courses on how to teach and use writing throughout the curriculum. A five year grant from the Charles A. Dana Foundation brought the best humanities teachers from 13 southeastern liberal arts colleges to Emory for a year to interact with one another in a special seminar, to develop new courses, to teach Emory undergraduates and to pursue their individual research projects. In 1990, Emory College was one of two private universities to receive a challenge grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to endow Distinguished Teaching Professorships. Monies were raised to fund these Teaching Professorships permanently. The annual Emory Williams Teaching Award instituted in 1972 honors excellent teachers and the Methodist Teacher Scholar Award begun in

1981 recognizes the faculty member who successfully combines teaching and scholarship.

Most of these teaching programs, however, largely benefitted the regular faculty and undergraduates and had little impact on graduate students. Emory had relied on individual departments to train graduate students for the teaching profession. Unfortunately, this strategy resulted in many of our graduate students completing their degrees and entering the professoriate having little, if any, teaching experience, and often even less pedagogical training. Those who did teach often came to regard their teaching experience as "dues to be paid" rather than an integral part of their education and career. A number of graduate students held university fellowships that exempted them from any responsibilities other than fulfilling their degree programs. A system in which the highest honors and rewards were offered to those students who do not teach sent a powerful message to graduate students: research is important, but teaching is not. In keeping with Emory's interest in teaching and its recent emphasis on teaching programs for faculty, this system required some change.

Our particular challenge as a private research university was to provide good teaching opportunities for our graduate students and to maintain excellent instruction for undergraduate students. Since 1981, Emory College had grown by 1,100 students to an undergraduate enrollment of 4,400 students. Yet, many graduate students had few teaching opportunities. On the other hand, some were given a variety of teaching responsibilities, but the heavier loads unintentionally delayed their progress to degree. While we respected the tradition not to "use teaching assistants" to staff too many courses, both the changing demographics of the professoriate and the need to provide the best and fullest education for our graduate students led us to develop a program which would assure that both our undergraduate population and our graduate students would be well served.

We initiated the discussion of our proposed program in spring 1990 in a series of small luncheon discussions with chairs of departments and their directors of graduate studies. They voiced their support for a teacher training program, which was echoed by our students. Individual graduate students and the representatives of graduate student organizations, school wide as well as department specific, requested additional Teaching Assistant training and more teaching opportunities. Spurred on by the interest and enthusiasm of both faculty and graduate students, we hosted a workshop in September 1990 and invited departmental chairs and directors of graduate studies to meet with those responsible for training graduate students as teachers at Syracuse University, the University of Guelph, Cornell University, Bowling Green State University, Georgia State University and Boston University. All of these schools were represented at the conference "Preparing the Professoriate for Tomorrow", sponsored by the American Association of Higher Education, the Council of Graduate Schools and the National Association of Foreign Graduate Students, which we attended in the fall of 1989. The faculty from these schools were chosen to participate in our workshop for two reasons primarily: some of them represented private institutions that had a graduate school wide program for training graduate students as teachers; others had experience with English as a Second Language training programs

which we also were instituting at this time. The experiences of these colleagues, at Emory and elsewhere, informed us about how others were training graduate students as teachers and helped us to construct our program.

From the workshop emerged the outline of our program which was brought to the department chairs, the Executive Committee of the Graduate School, and the directors of graduate studies. We asked these faculty members in turn to discuss the program in their home departments. Each of the discussions was lively, raised questions about the program, gave useful input and led to modifications. The departments which had a teacher training program, such as Psychology, Art History, French and Women's Studies, welcomed a program that would supplement and build upon their existing strategies, incorporating materials that were not included in discipline specific seminars. The departments which did not currently have a teacher training program--Mathematics, Political Science, the Institute for Liberal Arts among them--welcomed this program as an impetus for them to develop their own complementary programs.

The Executive Committee of the Graduate School, an elected body of 9 faculty, approved the program in spring of 1991. When the program was announced, some faculty maintained they were not consulted. What we did not anticipate was that not all Chairs and/or Directors of Graduate Studies had fully discussed the program in their departments. The TATTO program was the first graduate school requirement instituted which affected all doctoral programs since the composition of the Executive Committee had transformed from a body consisting of all Directors of Graduate Studies to the 9 elected representatives. Some faculty believed that the entire graduate faculty should have voted upon this fundamental change in doctoral requirements. There was (and still is) no mechanism for such a full faculty vote (although there is a proposal for a change in governance which will require that upon petition such a vote may be taken). Support from the President and the Provost aided the Graduate School in moving ahead with the program. In addition, there were many faculty and departments who were enthusiastic about the initiative. The Dean of the Graduate School appointed a faculty committee to review each departmental TATTO program.

Some schools might find it better to start the program department by department. However, we did find that most departments wanted the program when it became clear that students had to complete the TATTO program in order to be eligible for the Assistant Instructorship (Dean's Teaching Fellowship). The science departments are least enticed by this incentive because their students are likely to be on grant support when they have completed their TATTO requirements. Some faculty in the Graduate Division of Biological and Biomedical Sciences remain the most reluctant because they view time teaching as time away from the laboratories. However, the Director of the GDBBS, the Dean of the Medical School, and many of the faculty and graduate students support the program. The Chemistry department has become very diligent in their implementation of the program as TATTO has contributed positively both to its graduate and undergraduate programs.

The Teaching Associateship, the fourth stage of the TATTO program, advances the graduate student to a teaching opportunity with greater responsibilities. The Teaching Associate and a faculty member engage in a co-teaching experience. Although co-teaching experiences differ from department to department, the signature of the Teaching Associateship is the close partnership of the faculty member and the graduate student. In many departments, co-teaching involves the graduate student and faculty member cooperating on all aspects of a course, from syllabus design to final grading. As does the Teaching Assistant, the Teaching Associate receives attentive mentoring and evaluation.

Students who have satisfactorily completed all four stages of the TATTO program are eligible for a Assistant Instructor Fellowship (Dean's Teaching Fellowship). Dean's Teaching Fellows are entirely responsible for all the responsibilities of teaching a course including designing the syllabus, selecting books, teaching, and assigning grades. The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences offers a number of these fellowships to students (usually in their fifth year) on a competitive basis. Assistant Instructors teach one course each semester while making considerable progress on their doctoral dissertations. Departments nominate students, based on their teaching qualifications and advancement in their degree programs. The applicants submit teaching evaluations, a statement of teaching aims, and, in consultation with the department, a plan for teaching specific courses. Ideally, Assistant Instructors teach one introductory and one upper level course. A faculty committee selects the Assistant Instructors. Assistant Instructors have suggested that we change the name of this position to Dean's Teaching Fellows.

In sum, the required four stages of the TATTO program provide graduate students with credible training and optimal teaching experiences: (1) the Graduate School course, (2) the departmental course, (3) one teaching Assistantship, and (4) one Teaching Associateship. While the Graduate School requires these minimum teaching experiences, departments may require additional teaching training and teaching opportunities. However, the Graduate School established a maximum of four teaching experiences (including at least one Teaching Assistantship and one Teaching Associateship) during a student's first four years, to ensure that students not be overtaxed in pursuing the doctorate in a timely fashion. Highly qualified graduate students are then eligible to compete for Assistant Instructorships (Dean's Teaching Fellowship) and teach two courses.

Although all Ph.D. students are required to participate in the TATTO program as part of their education for the professoriate, there are some exceptions and special conditions. In addition to the English as a Second Language requirement for International students, students who matriculate with prior teaching experience may be exempt from the Teaching Assistantship. However, the Graduate School course can not be waived; some of the material is specific to the Emory University and Emory College environment. Although the underlying premise of the TATTO program is that teaching ability can and should be taught rather than taken for granted, the Graduate School recognizes that some graduate students' teaching performance may require limiting their teaching opportunities. When a department

makes such a determination, notifies the Graduate School. Because one of the aims of the TATTO program is to ensure quality teaching, these students will not participate further in the TATTO program.

E. EVALUATION/PROJECT RESULTS

The Graduate School has evaluated both the program and the participants in the program. Graduate students evaluate all aspects of the Graduate School course; departments have instituted various mechanisms to evaluate the teaching assistants and teaching associates, including faculty observation, student evaluations, and videotaping. The Graduate School engaged the services of Alphonse Damico, Professor of Political Science at the University of Florida, to evaluate the entire TATTO program. Professor Damico spent the year as a Visiting Professor of Political Science in 1993-94. Professor Damico had been Director of Graduate Studies at the University of Florida. He also had evaluated the use of graduate students as teachers at the University of Florida. The following is his evaluation of the program:

> The major purpose of this evaluation is to assess how well TATTO is working by comparing the program's stated objectives with its operation. FIPSE views a project as broadly successful if its various parts continue to cohere once put into practice and if the project as a whole is incorporated into the formal structure of the University. Relevant items to investigate include whether or not a program becomes part of the University's recurring budget, whether there is adequate support staff, the degree to which administrative mechanics assure oversight and coordination of efforts. Beyond this assessment of TATTO's formal institutionalization, there is need to examine the program in terms of those faculty and students whose experience it is. This more local inquiry means listening to what people say about the program, looking at what they say they are doing and whether they are doing it, and judging whether their efforts are focused and genuine or desultory and half-hearted.
>
> Finally, program reviews can and should occasion discussion of how objectives might be consolidated, refined, and, when appropriate, revised. The recommendations that appear throughout this review are meant to encourage the Emory community to undertake that effort. Some of the recommendations are minor, a few (the controversial ones) are not.
>
> Data for this program evaluation were gathered during the 1993-94 academic year while the reviewer was a visiting faculty member in Emory's Department of Political Science. The teacher training program was only in its third year while data were being collected. This meant that while the total number of students who were enrolled in some phase of the program was large, the number of students who had completed all phases of the program was relatively small. It would therefore have been premature to try to examine in a more quantitative way the possible effects of TATTO on such things as job placement. Or,

to cite one more example, it is interesting to compare the undergraduate student evaluations of courses taught by graduate students prior to the TATTO program with those taught by students who had completed the program. But the numbers are far too small to support any statistical analysis. This assessment relies therefore on more qualitative strategies for program review.

While the actual information gathering was not entirely sequential, by and large it involved three activities. The first was a *document review*. This meant reading the historical record surrounding the program's creation, correspondence between the Graduate School and the departments, department course syllabi relevant to TATTO, the graduates students' evaluations of the Graduate School course, undergraduate student evaluations of graduate student courses, students' teaching portfolios, and all other relevant written material. This was followed by *interviews with the faculty* member responsible for supervising his or her Department's TATTO program. In all but one case this Professor was the Department's Director of Graduate Studies. Interviews were conducted with representatives from fifteen of the twenty departments within the College of Arts and Sciences. Other more informal discussions brought the number of faculty who discussed their views of the program to about twenty two.

Additional and valuable information about the program came from *meetings with graduate students*. Four of these meetings were held with students in very different programs. The departments represented included two from the social sciences, and one each from the humanities and sciences. Additionally, the student group typically included six students--two who had completed TATTO, two who were in the last stages of the program, and two at the beginning. Altogether comments were solicited from twenty students, although most of these were in meetings of four to six students.

The review is organized around how well the two major units responsible for the program--the Graduate School and the Departments--are performing tasks essential to its success.

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

From the outset Emory University, more specifically the Graduate School, has carried the major costs of the TATTO program. The institution has committed more than five dollars for each grant dollar awarded by FIPSE. Total program costs is five hundred thousand dollars annually. The largest part of this expense is dedicated to graduate student stipends for participation in the Graduate School course and for the Assistant Instructor Fellowships. The latter costs are now part of the Graduate School's recurring budget; the former are funded from unused stipends. This is certainly the best single indicator of the program's institutionalization and formal success.

In addition to budgetary support, the Graduate School Dean, the Associate Vice President of the Graduate School, and two Associate Deans have devoted a lot of time to the development and oversight of the program. The Dean and Associate Vice President have aggressively characterized and articulated the program's major goals for the Emory community. The Associate Deans have greater responsibility for developing the Graduate School course, overseeing the creation of instruments for evaluating student performance at the program's various stages, and for the program's day to day administration. These tasks are done energetically and skillfully.

Program Flexibility & Program Integrity

The TATTO program poses a major administrative challenge for the Graduate School. The administration must, on the one hand, define and maintain common standards of excellence and uniform criteria of program performance in order to guarantee that TATTO is an equal part of every student's graduate training. But departments are very different, and these differences must be accommodated. The trick, of course, is knowing when program success is furthered by program flexibility and when that flexibility jeopardizes the integrity of the program, reproducing in effect the status quo ante. The Graduate School is keenly aware of these dilemmas and acts continuously to manage them. But it might be useful to look at an instance in which this has been done well and another where the outcome is still uncertain.

To sustain program consistency across departments, the Graduate School sought to standardize assessment of graduate student teaching across the university. Additionally, the evaluation process requires students to develop a teaching portfolio that can be used in support of their job applications. Departments were required to carry out a large number of uniform evaluation procedures. These included classroom observation by the supervising faculty member, videotaping, self-evaluation forms, undergraduate student evaluations, and annual letters of evaluation. But problems soon appeared. Most departments fairly objected that these demands were excessive, some complained that they duplicated or displaced procedures that they already had in place, a few merely repeated their objections to any directive originating in the Graduate School. The Dean's office moved quickly to respond to these objections. They encouraged departments to retain existing evaluation activities that had proved effective; they told departments to use their own discipline specific evaluation instruments so long as these provided a record of student performance. In short, there was insistence upon the need for student assessment but flexibility as to how that assessment would be achieved. While the conversations were sometimes bruising, this phase of TATTO struck the right administrative note.

This episode also underscores one other administrative lesson. By endorsing a specific set of evaluation activities and instruments, the Graduate School forced departments to

discuss and review their procedures for mentoring and monitoring their teaching assistants and teaching associates. As one department's TATTO coordinator commented, "before we just assumed that we were all evaluating our students, now we know when someone isn't." But the department interviews revealed that several departments were either not engaged in evaluating their teaching assistants and associates or, in a few cases, did the evaluations but did not use them, i.e., they were filed away. Given these realties, the Graduate School will need to continue its policy of resisting calls from some departments for complete autonomy in how they administer their teacher training programs. An initiative such as TATTO must insist upon specific measures for implementing the program's goals. To do otherwise is to hope for the organizational equivalent of a personal epiphany.

A counter example, one that warns of the dangers of excessive program flexibility and illustrates the need for conceptual revision, is suggested by the program's limited success in implementing Stage Four, the teaching associateship. The teaching associateship is supposed to differ from the teaching assistantship. The associateship is characterized as a "co-teaching experience." Normally, this would mean a faculty member and student cooperating in the teaching of some course. The student might, for example, give several lectures, lead discussion sessions, help construct exams, advise students, and so forth. But the core of a "co-teaching" activity must involve teaching; advising and grading are teaching related activities, but they are not a teaching experience. If the Graduate School allows teaching related activities to count as the functional equivalent of a "co-teaching" experience, the Teaching Associateship will not be a "teaching opportunity" that advances the student beyond the third stage of teacher training.

The problem is that the nature of Stage Four, a "co-teaching experience," is too easily hollowed out whenever departments are given great leeway in how to implement this phase of the student's teacher training. Unlike the requirement that gives departments considerable independence in how they evaluate their students' teaching activities, Stage Four is an instance where program integrity and program flexibility--as currently configured--do not seem compatible. The "co-teaching experience" envisions a faculty member and student cooperating in the teaching of a course or working closely together in a way that makes the student a better teacher. This mentoring and apprentice relationship is more unusual than usual. Seminar presentations, research proposal defenses, advising undergraduates--all have been described by some department as a "co-teaching experience." At the other extreme, one department lists the student's "full responsibility for teaching this undergraduate course" as a "coteaching experience." Refreshing is the department that faces its problems and states that it "is impossible for most of its students to meet the teaching associate requirement by co-teaching."

It would be unfair and inaccurate to charge every department that has problems arranging co-teaching experiences with acting in bad faith. Some face genuine difficulties. For some, undergraduate enrollments create a situation where graduate students must often assume full responsibility for teaching a course, a responsibility that effectively advances them to teaching without the apprenticeship envisioned by the Teaching Associateship. This appears to be the case, for example, in two departments with very large undergraduate enrollments. Conversely, there are departments where the number of graduate students is too large relative to the number of undergraduate courses to afford every student an opportunity to be a 'co-teacher.' There are no clear remedies for the impact that these facts have on Stage Four of the program.

Recommendation--The Graduate School should convene a faculty committee to revise Stage Four of the TATTO program. That committee should be charged with recommending ways in which all departments might satisfy the co-teaching requirement or, since this seems unlikely, revising the requirement so that co-teaching is only one of several tracks constituting the Teaching Associateship. Program flexibility should be increased, e.g., with more associateship "tracks," but simultaneously constrained by guidelines that limit what can count as an associateship.

The Graduate School Course

As previously noted, all students are required to take a course organized by the Graduate School before being assigned any teaching responsibilities. The Graduate School course reflects the Graduate School's ultimate responsibility for the larger program; it creates a forum and laboratory for participating faculty to discuss teacher training issues. In reviewing the Graduate School course, three sources of information were utilized: 1) student evaluations of the course, 2) interviews with Graduate School staff most directly responsible for the course, and 3) interviews with graduate students who had completed the course.

The simplest statement about the Graduate School course is that to date each subsequent offering has demonstrated marked improvement. When first offered, students complained that the course was too long (one week), the sessions too talky, and some of the topics dangerously close to platitudinous. These observations were confirmed by the course evaluations (below average) completed by the students at the end of the week. The summer of '92, year two of the program, showed marked improvement and 1993 and 1994 continued this trend. Students now rate the course as "good to very good." These numerical scores were confirmed by interviews with graduate students who had completed the course. In approximately eighteen cases, every student that had taken the course in 1993 commented more favorably upon it than those who had taken it in 1992 or 1991. And the same pattern held for the differences between the classes of 1992 and 1991. Indeed, "are you sure you took the same course?" was a common group observation. Clearly, the

deans and the participating faculty deserve a lot of credit for using each Graduate School course as an occasion for improving the next summer's offering.

The Graduate School course is a success. Students particularly enjoy the small group sessions, the opportunity to meet with veterans of the TATTO program, and the very popular microteaching activities. But there is room for further improvement.

Students still question the time spent hearing about campus resources, the honor code, or topics that are mainly information items. These sessions do not do well in the course evaluations, and they were frequently criticized during the student interviews. Generally, the sense is that this information could be distributed as written material. Some suggested that it would be more efficient (and shorter) for the departments to assume the major responsibility for discussing this material with students when they are assigned teaching responsibilities. The Graduate School revised the format in which this material is discussed during the Graduate School course.

Science students, especially those who devote most of their time to laboratory research, are most likely to wonder about the importance of a teacher training program for their future careers." This is an important doubt that should be addressed more directly. It is easy to reassure these students (and ourselves) that teaching skills and experiences have a value beyond the classroom, more difficult to explain and defend the reassurance.

As the Dean's office is aware, the session on ethics and teaching has yet to be adequately organized or its content carefully articulated. Graduate students reacted most favorably to the most recent offering.

Recommendations--If the new format for organizing the information sessions is unsuccessful, this material should continue to be distributed at the Graduate School course. However, the department TATTO directors should be assigned primary responsibility for meeting with each teaching assistant or associate to discuss the information when giving them their semester assignments.

As part of the Graduate School course, Stage One of TATTO, a workshop should more directly engage science students in a discussion of the relevance of teaching experiences for those who expect to pursue nonteaching careers. The workshop should be led by a science faculty member who has experience working for the government or private industry and who has reflected upon this topic. If necessary, the Graduate School should consider providing a faculty member with some support (e.g., a modest summer stipend) to prepare such a workshop.

The workshop on ethics and politics should be closely reviewed after the 1994 Graduate School course and monitored by an external observer in 1995.

The Assistant Instructor Fellowship

All students are required to complete Stages One through Four of the TATTO program. The assistant instructor fellowship, awarded on a competitive basis, provides some students with fifth year funding. For 1993--94 the base budget of the Graduate School funded twenty fellowships. That number is expected to grow over time. (In 1994-95, the Graduate School budget funded 23 Assistant Instructors.) Each Assistant Instructor has full responsibility for one course each semester. The normal expectation is that fellows will teach an introductory level course one semester and an upper-level course the other semester. The fellowship rewards students who have excelled in the TATTO program, and it also reintegrates teaching with research. The likelihood that a candidate will make substantial progress on his/her dissertation is an additional criterion for the award. For these reasons, it is anticipated that most fellows will teach an upper-level course closely tied to their dissertation topic.

Faculty and students are unanimous in their support for the instructor fellowships. There are some questions about a few aspects of the program. Some faculty felt that teaching interfered with a student's ability to complete the dissertation in a timely manner. But since none wanted to abolish the fifth year funding, their complaint can better be read as support for a system of dissertation fellowships which, of course, should be done. Other questions about the program revolve around selection of fellows and flexibility in the fellowship assignment.

Several TATTO faculty supervisors stated that they did not know why their fellowship candidates were successful or unsuccessful. As funding for more fellowships improves, this might become less of a problem. But for now the Graduate School's selection committee should try to make more explicit their criteria for choosing fellows.

Most desired increased flexibility. Currently, the program recognizes that some students need to spend a year doing field research, thus delaying for one year their application to the fellowship program. Some, including graduate students, wondered about the fellow's assigned courses and whether it would be better to repeat one course rather than preparing two new courses while working on the dissertation. Again, others noted that job candidates might be more successful if they have taught several courses. These are differences of opinion, and none is obviously right or wrong. The same is true for the suggestion that some students might make better progress on their dissertation if they taught both courses one semester and were completely free to write up their dissertation the other semester. This might be appropriate for a few students, but it

would have to be determined on a case by case basis. Again, the fellowships serve a variety of purposes, and they will not always be perfectly complementary.

Recommendations--Departments should have flexibility in assigning fellows teaching duties. Eg., when appropriate and feasible in light of departmental teaching needs and the fellow's dissertation activities, a fellow might teach two courses in one semester, teach the same course twice, and so forth. The Graduate School should track the time to degree of fellows and include this information in the annual report of the Graduate School.

THE DEPARTMENTS

The Department Course

After the Graduate School course, the next stage of the teacher training program is the discipline based course that is the responsibility of each department.. Department TATTO courses vary in format, less so in purpose. One department might use a guest lecturer, another might assign a reading for discussion; both are about how to make the classroom a more inviting place. This is just one instance of two ways of accomplishing the same purpose. In fact, what is most striking about Stage Two is how developed it has become in just three years. One department has articulated its schedule of teaching topics so they will correspond to when students are likely to need that information as they become teaching assistants and associates. Another has expanded its teacher training course into a forum where, for example, scholarship on gender based differences in learning is seriously discussed. In another department, two faculty members have gone even further; they have plans to track how TATTO affects the distribution of their students among different specialties, an effect for which there is preliminary evidence.

A review of the departments' program descriptions, which many mail to prospective candidates for admission, and the teacher training syllabi created for Stage Two demonstrate that most departments have devoted great care and, in several cases, considerable originality in preparing their students for a teaching career. Excitement and enthusiasm on the part of faculty and graduate students were common attitudes.

But the success of Stage Two is incomplete and sometimes uneven. Some department courses or versions of Stage Two are either nonexistent or of marginal quality. Several strategies used in trying to assess the department TATTO courses support this conclusion. A request was made of each department TATTO supervisor for copies of (a) the department's handout for new graduate students describing their TATTO program, (b) the name of the faculty member responsible for Stage Two, the department course, and (c) a copy of the syllabus or, less formally, schedule of events or topics that constitute the course. Only one department was unable to provide any of this information or materials. Only two department TATTO representatives were unsure about which faculty member was responsible for the

course. Two other departments rely primarily upon the support staff, typically the department's administrative assistant or secretary, to oversee the scheduling of activities that make up the department's course. While these are serious deficiencies, especially since the most recalcitrant department is also one of the largest in the College, a very large number of departments immediately provided the information requested. Just as much of this success belongs to the department's TATTO supervisors, so do some of the problems.

The TATTO Supervisor

A characteristic quality of the graduate student interviews directly bears upon the department courses or Stage Two of TATTO. Namely, there is a clear mimetic relationship between faculty responses to the program's requirements and student responses. Departments unsure of TATTO's value have graduate students who share that uncertainty or, in some instances, hostility.

Now that departments have had time to better figure out what works and what does not in the TATTO program, it would be helpful to provide a forum in which problems, solutions, complaints, suggestions can be regularly discussed.

Recommendations--Department chairs should nominate faculty members who will serve as supervisors of the TATTO program. But these nominations should be subject to the approval of the Dean of the Graduate SchooL. The Graduate School should include TATTO as an agenda item at one of the regular meetings of the Directors of Graduate Studies. All TATTO supervisors should be invited.

The Teaching Portfolio

Many of the evaluation instruments used to track a student's progress during their teacher training are important items for creating a teaching portfolio. These include faculty observations of classroom teaching, the student's statement of teaching aims, tests, syllabi, and course evaluations. One particularly well monitored program includes a series of very short essays in which students reflect upon what they have learned from different teaching opportunities. Those essays drive home the point that good teaching depends upon knowing what you are teaching and caring about what your students are learning. In many departments faculty and student work together to create an informative and attractive portfolio that the student can submit in support of his or her job candidacy. These efforts should be acknowledged and encouraged.

THE ACADEMIC CULTURE

The academic culture refers to how faculty and student interactions are organized and to the values given pride of place by those interaction patterns. Two truths control any attempt to change the academic culture: these institutional

practices and the values that they instantiate are enormously complex and resistant to change. But TATTO has succeeded in changing Emory's academic culture and that success in just three years overshadows all of the program's problems. Departments use TATTO to recruit and to place students, increasing numbers of faculty participate in department courses where they meet with students to discuss teaching excellence, evaluation instruments for tracking the performance of students as teaching assistants and associates are being used by departments that previously shunned this task, the fellowships for assistant instructors bring faculty and students together in support of a nomination for a teaching reward: these and other practices are now integral parts of graduate education at Emory.

Sixth Year Review

As part of its continuing responsibility for supervising and coordinating the TATTO program, the Graduate School should conduct an internal review of the program during its sixth year. By that time, there will be enough program experience to develop more reliable measures of TATTO's effects. The following list is more illustrative than exhaustive, but the review should include measures of such outcomes as the effects of TATTO for

-- recruitment of new students
-- student satisfaction with their teaching experiences and opportunities
-- evaluations of courses taught by the Teaching Fellows compared to department and college means
-- the time to degree, especially of Assistant Instructor Fellows
-- job placement
-- the reward system for faculty important to TATTO's success and vitality

F. CONTINUATION AND DISSEMINATION

As Professor Damico's evaluation reports, TATTO is an ongoing program at Emory University. Departments have institutionalized their programs. The Graduate School will also continue to ask for increases in the Assistant Instructor program (which has been renamed at the suggestion of the graduate students as Dean's Teaching Fellows), and hopes eventually to secure funds to name these fellowships. The Graduate School will continue to evaluate all aspects of the program, including a reexamination of the departmental implementation of the various stages of the program. The Graduate School was invited to submit a grant to the Preparing Future Faculty program sponsored by PEW Charitable Trusts, the Council of Graduate Schools and the American Association of Colleges and Universities. Some 70 research universities submitted proposals; although we were in the second round of 17, we did not receive one of the five larger grants. However, a consortium of Agnes Scott College, Oglethorpe University, Spelman College, and Emory University's Graduate School be offering a series of colloquia focused on issues of teaching at a liberal arts college during the next year and one-half. Faculty from each of the schools

and Emory graduate students will plan and participate in the colloquia. Faculty, administrators, and graduate students will be giving presentations at a number of national meetings (Council of Graduate Schools, Council of Southern Graduate Schools, Association of American Colleges and Universities, American Council on Education, American Association of Higher Education, and so forth) about the TATTO program and the extension of this program. Emory faculty are giving presentations about the TATTO program at their discipline professional meetings. They distribute the TATTO brochure and other information at these meetings.

G. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A survey of graduate departments indicated that teaching training and teaching by graduate students was occasional and inconsistent at best. Few departments had regular, developed programs to prepare their graduate students to enter the classroom. This finding coupled with the belief that graduate departments have a responsibility to train their doctoral students in teaching as well as research led the Graduate School to develop and require a Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity (TATTO) program for all doctoral students. The Graduate School, after meetings with chairs of departments, directors of graduate studies, and colleagues from other universities, developed a multi-stage program of teaching training and opportunities.

The decision to require TATTO resulted in fierce opposition from a few chairs and faculty who felt that departmental autonomy was abridged. However, the assurance that departments were to develop their own programs within the general guidelines of the TATTO program and the review of these programs by a faculty committee facilitated implementation of the program. The support of Emory's President and Provost was critical to accomplishing the goals of the program. Full institutional backing for the concept as well as for the financial needs of the program was essential. The decision to implement the program across all departments, rather than to introduce it on a voluntary basis, while politically difficult, proved effective. Had the Graduate School taken the "safer" route, the opposition of some departments would probably have precluded the universal adoption of the program. TATTO has entered both the Emory culture and the Emory vocabulary. As more and more faculty and graduate students become involved with the program, it becomes their program and ceases to be seen solely a creature of the Graduate School. Increasingly, departments cite TATTO as a strength of their doctoral programs in recruiting and placing graduate students.

Throughout the generation and the implementation of TATTO, the Graduate School has tried to be responsive to student and faculty comments and suggestions. This continual feedback has been most useful in revising the Graduate School course. Departments formulate the disciplinary course, the teaching assistantship, and the teaching associateship according to their own needs and specifications. The tension between this flexibility and the need for oversight remains. Continual review, evaluation, and consultation are necessary to assure a high quality program.

APPENDIX

The project director Preston Forbes was very helpful during our grant period. His visit to the campus and his contact with faculty gave the project a needed legitimization from the "outside." His comments and his suggestions were particularly helpful. The annual meetings exchanging information provided us with a sense of perspective about our project as well as insights from the other grantees.